



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,906	03/04/2004	Kazutaka Tasaka	65326-032	4470
<div>7590 McDermott, Will &amp; Emery 600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096.</div>			<div>EXAMINER PHAM, HAI CHI</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 2861</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
			<div>MAIL DATE 01/23/2007</div>	<div>DELIVERY MODE PAPER</div>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/791,906	TASAKA, KAZUTAKA	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Hai C. Pham	2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hai C. Pham. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Nathaniel D. McQueen, Attorney. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 16 January 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 18 and 30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mitsuka (US 4,687,944), Edamitsu (US 6,729,239), Hideshima (US 2003/0136286).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

- (1) Discuss the first version of the proposed amendment to the base claims. The examiner suggests rewording the claimed language with regard to the added claimed limitation to make it clear that the distortion of the original image in the subscan direction is a result of the modification process of the original image and as such to relate the distortion to the width modification of the original image. The examiner also indicates that such amendment would not yet overcome the teaching of the prior art in Mitsuka since Mitsuka teaches a magnification converter for modifying the width of the original image in the subscan direction based on the magnification factor, such modification is treated as a distortion being made to the original image in the subscan direction.
- (2) Applicant's Representative argues that there is no motivation/suggestion for combining Mitsuka and Edamitsu. The examiner indicates that since the original image is modified (as taught by Mitsuka), there is a need for modifying the writing timing in the main scan direction by changing a cycle of the writing clock as taught by Edamitsu for the purpose of aligning the successive scan lines.
- (3) Discuss the second version of the proposed amendment to the base claims to include the plurality of light beams aligned in the subscan direction (i.e., limitation found in the original claim 7). The examiner indicates that such limitation was met by the third reference in Hideshima.

HCP

01/16/07